

Nation over rise up in righteous indignation at the suggestion of socialized medicine. However, the complete control of medical care by any one organization in California is no less evil.

Many sincere doctors of medicine must question A.M.A. approval of a new medical school (California College of Medicine, formerly College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons) in less than a year, the proposal to award a \$65.00 M.D. degree to over 2,000 D.O.'s with whom their leaders consistently prohibited professional association, and the complete capitulation of the second largest state medical association in the country to the demands of a handful of osteopathic politicians.

Both organized medicine and organized osteopathy will in the long run suffer if the merger is consummated. Many California people do not want licensing of D.O.'s to be discontinued. Apparently neither the leaders of the California Osteopathic Association nor of the California Medical Association care what the people think. *The American Osteopathic Association does—and we support their opinion.*

When organized medicine or organized osteopathy forgets the people they serve, they court disaster.

The voice of the people is important, and it will be heard.

Editor's note

The pages appearing in this "Special reprints" section have been electronically scanned from the original journals in which they appeared. Consequently, the scanning process at a density to enhance readability has picked up such artifacts as "bleed-through" type from reverse pages and other "blemishes" that existed in the original paper on which the text was printed. Even the yellowing of the original pages has caused some darkening of the margins. JAOA regrets these anomalies and hopes that readers will overlook them and concentrate on the content of these works published in the osteopathic medical profession's early history.

For interest sake, concluding pages of articles may contain "newsy" items of the original date.

Gilbert E. D'Alonzo, DO
June 2001

EDITORIALS

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION

This periodical is the official publication of the American Osteopathic Association.

Editor	George W. Northup, D.O.
Associate Editor	Katherine Becker
Assistant Editor	Barbara E. Peterson
President	Charles L. Naylor, D.O.
Executive Director	True B. Eveleth, D.O.
Business Manager	Walter A. Suberg

Signifying what?

Last year Dr. Dorothy Marsh reported to the membership of the California Osteopathic Association that the qualifications necessary for the M.D. degree were submission of evidence of an unrevoked license as a physician and surgeon in the State of California, a D.O. degree granted by a college approved by the Board of Osteopathic Examiners of the State of California, and good moral character, with the application to be reviewed by the College and sent to its Board of Trustees with recommendations. Either Dr. Marsh neglected to inform C.O.A. members of the most important qualification or it was added later by the California Medical Association. In an address before the Council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association, as reported in the L.A.C.M.A. *Bulletin* for April 19, 1962, Dr. Wayne E. Pollock, chairman of the C.M.A. Committee on Other Professions, announced as the *first* requirement for the new M.D. degree that the applicant must have studied in an approved medical school for an academic year (9 months) prior to the granting of the M.D. degree.

He also reported that the degrees will be granted in four separate locations throughout the state and *without publicity*. He did not predict *when* this event would take place.

As time goes on it becomes obvious that the California Medical Association has been telling its membership one thing and the California Osteo-

pathic Association has been telling its membership another. To any of those around the country who have viewed with covetous eyes the acquisition of an M.D. degree, the unfolding developments in California should be a sobering revelation. To even the most naive, it should be apparent that someone is being double crossed. And it is not organized medicine. Furthermore, it is apparent that the leaders of the California Medical Association have more than one ace up their sleeves.

As far as the osteopathic physician in California was concerned, the M.D. degree was the major plum dangled in front of his envious eyes. The only trouble is the plum has a worm in it. One cannot but wonder what will become of other "rewards," such as hospital appointments, specialty certification, and community status.

The merger balloon in California has developed a leak. Like most balloons, it was filled with gas.

"Signifying nothing"

Since it became a matter of public record that the new California College of Medicine is now an accredited medical school as a result of official action of the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association and the Executive Council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, some osteopathic physicians have inquired as to whether there might be some value in obtaining an M.D. degree from that school. As has been previously reported, the California College of Medicine as a now-accredited medical school intends to grant retroactive M.D. degrees to those graduates of osteopathic colleges with a license to practice in California, an acceptable application, and \$65.

However, before there is any rush to medical education's bargain counter, it would be well for members of the osteopathic profession to study carefully a letter which has been transmitted to the secretaries of state boards of medical examiners. The letter, announcing the accreditation of the California College of Medicine as a medical school, has this to say:

... as a result of this action, the current fourth year class of the California College of Medicine, which will graduate in June 1962, will be recognized as graduates of an accredited medical school. *Graduates of that institution prior to February 15, 1962 are not affected and should not be recognized as graduates of an accredited school.* (Italics supplied.)

This letter was signed by Walter S. Wiggins, M.D., secretary of the A.M.A. Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, and Ward Darley, M.D., executive director of the Association of American Medical Colleges. Therefore, it seems apparent that neither the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals nor the Association of American Medical Colleges intends that M.D. degrees granted by the

newly approved California College of Medicine to those who graduated before February 15, 1962, will be acceptable degrees.

The truth of that old cliché, "you get what you pay for," seems to be demonstrated once again in California. It is interesting to observe that even members of the California Osteopathic Association are beginning to wonder what their \$65 is buying. Apparently there have been so many requests for clarification made to the California Osteopathic Association that its president, Dr. J. Ralph Hughes, found it necessary to say the following in the March 1962 issue of the *California Clinician*:

I have been asked on many occasions why the fee of \$65 is to accompany the application for the degree from the California College of Medicine. The \$65 is broken down as follows: There is a \$25 matriculation fee, there is a \$25 graduation fee, and \$15 to help defray the processing of applications. The final approval of each application for the issuance of the degree rests with the Admissions and Credentials Committee and the Board of Trustees of the California College of Medicine.

Dr. Hughes then goes on to comment:

As yet, the exact mechanism for conferring of the degrees has not been decided. As the result of considerable conversation between the responsible parties of the California Medical Association, the California Osteopathic Association, and medical educators, it has been decided that the exact mechanism will be the responsibility of the "Education Committee." The Education Committee is composed of the deans of four medical schools in the Los Angeles area, President Henley, and one or two additional faculty members from the California College of Medicine. When this exact mechanism has been determined, you will all receive notification giving all the particulars by which this important step will be accomplished.

At the March 25, 1962, meeting of the Executive Committee of the A.O.A. Board of Trustees, the question of the ethics of an unearned M.D. degree was discussed. The Executive Committee interpreted the term "degree" in Chapter II, Article I, Sections 7(c) and 7(d) of the A.O.A. Code of Ethics to mean a degree which is earned during actual attendance at a college while it is approved by a national professional association, and stated that any D.O. who seeks an unearned degree is placing his A.O.A. membership in jeopardy. The Code of Ethics sections referred to above read as follows:

Sec. 7 (c) It is unethical for an osteopathic physician to hold forth or to indicate possession of any degree recognized as the basis for licensure to practice the healing arts unless he is actually licensed in the state in which he practices on the basis of that degree or could have been licensed at the time he received the degree or subsequently on the basis of that degree in the state where he now practices.

Sec. 7 (d) It is unethical for an osteopathic physician to seek to acquire or receive a degree from a school or college of the healing arts which is not approved by the national professional organization recognized by the United States Office of Education as representative of that school or college of the healing arts.

In a note to all divisional society presidents and secretaries and specialty college and board officers,

A.O.A. Executive Director True B. Eveleth pointed out that this interpretation will clarify the status of those D.O.'s who now seek an M.D. degree from the California College of Medicine, as well as those who might seek the degree from any other institution of a similar nature.

Two things should now be obvious to members of the profession: First, the Executive Committee interprets the Code of Ethics of the American Osteopathic Association to mean that anyone seeking an unearned M.D. degree, that is, one received without actual attendance at a college approved during that period of attendance by the American Medical Association, places his future A.O.A. membership in jeopardy.

Second, the A.M.A. Council on Medical Education and Hospitals and the Association of American Medical Colleges seem to have made it clear that only those graduating from the California College of Medicine after February 15, 1962, will be considered by those bodies to have received an M.D. degree from an accredited medical school.

Therefore, in view of both the interpretation of the Executive Committee of the A.O.A. and the statement that the California College of Medicine cannot in fact issue retroactive M.D. degrees which will be considered as coming from an accredited medical school, the \$65 California medical degree seems, if anything, to be overpriced.

Apparently the California Medical Association and representatives of the American Medical Association were led to believe that the osteopathic physicians in California desired only an M.D. degree, without concern for its standing. And the leaders of the California Osteopathic Association seem to have been perfectly willing to have osteopathic physicians in California turn over a \$9,000,000 county hospital, a college, and control of several million dollars worth of osteopathic hospitals in California for two letters, which in this instance symbolize nothing.

In all this there is a matter of degree—not only M.D. or D.O.—but the degree of merit implied by the letters themselves. An earned M.D. degree or an earned D.O. degree represents an academic achievement worthy of pride.

Shakespeare in discussing the gift-certificate degree might have said something like this:

It is but a shadow, a poor substitute
That gives the holder his hour upon the
stage
And then is recognized no more; it is a
shell
Given as appeasement, full of sound and
fury, signifying nothing.

EDITORIALS

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION

This periodical is the official publication of the American Osteopathic Association.

Editor	George W. Northup, D.O.
Associate Editor	Katherine Becker
Assistant Editor	Barbara E. Peterson
President	Charles L. Naylor, D.O.
Executive Director	True B. Eveleth, D.O.
Business Manager	Walter A. Suberg

Who is there to listen?

Commenting favorably on recent JOURNAL editorials and in particular on the 1962 A. T. Still Memorial Lecture, a member of the profession posed a provocative question: Who is there to listen?

This is a good question and it deserves thought.

Does the profession really listen to the words of the officers of the American Osteopathic Association? Does the profession listen with its mind's eye to editorials, addresses, and organizational news? Are those in the profession who seem to feel that an M.D. degree is the answer to all of their problems really listening to what is happening in California? Of course, the answer to these and other questions can never be completely known. However, there is evidence that the profession is listening and beginning to understand better than ever before some of the problems it faces. There are manifestations of an increased desire to confront these problems and find their solution.

Who is there to listen? There are over 9,000 osteopathic physicians, members of the American Osteopathic Association, to listen. Regardless of previous opinions concerning the program of eliminating the osteopathic profession by *degree*, correspondence, personal contacts, and group discussions indicate that there are those who earlier viewed the